UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

MARTIN NIEMOELLER—

Louis Binstock

Homer A. Jack

Delos O'Brian

SOCIAL ACTION—

Philip Schug

John G. MacKinnon

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 12

Chicago, February, 1947

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

I. Allen: Former contributor to UNITY.

Louis Binstock: Rabbi of Temple Sholom, Chicago, Illinois.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Homer A. Jack: Executive Secretary of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination.

John G. MacKinnon: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Wilmington, Delaware.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Ben Meyers: Chicago Attorney.

Delos O'Brian: Minister-at-Large of the American Unitarian Association.

Philip Schug: Minister of the Unitarian Church of Urbana, Illinois.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 163

ARTICLES—
- Pastor Martin Niemoeller: 1937-1947—LOUIS BINSTOCK 164
- Pastor Niemoeller—Saint or Nazi?—HOMER A. JACK 165
- Protestantism's German Saint—DELOS O'BRIAN 167
- The Minister's Responsibility for Social Action—JOHN G. MACKINNON 168
- Social Action—PHILIP SCHUG 170
- A True Church—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 171
- Some of Our Best Friends Are Gentiles—I. ALLEN 172

POETRY—
- Our Gods Live in Hollywood—MANFRED A. CARTER 169

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Moral Absolutes—RANDALL S. HILTON 173
- Jewish Influence on Rembrandt—BEN MEYERS 174

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Scientists Become Socially Minded—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH ... 174
- Liberty Protects Itself—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 175
- More or Better Children?—MAY STRANATHAN 175

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 176

THE FIELD—
- The Four Winds—*Worldover Press* 162

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Four Winds

One of the most thorough investigations ever made into the social origins of crime is to be launched by Swedish penologists, social scientists, and physicians. Prosecuted persons will be studied in great detail, to discover any mental disorders, physical injuries, family, school, or other environmental factors that might explain subsequent anti-social behavior.

* * *

An example of cooperation across frontiers is given by Mahatma Gandhi's paper *Harijan,* which asserts that during a recent acute shortage of cloth in Afghanistan an appeal for help was sent to Jawaharlal Nehru, who referred it to Gandhi. A large quantity of cloth was made available, and plans are on foot for the sending of a group of Indian experts on hand-spinning to Afghanistan, to teach their methods widely.

* * *

Cuba's National Training School of Cooperation is now under the Ministry of Agriculture, which gives it aid with monthly salaries, technical help, and adequate quarters.

* * *

One billion kilowatts of electric power, according to the Italian newspaper, *Il Momento,* have "disappeared" in black market deals in northern Italy. In southern Italy the Naples-Rome express, sidetracked onto rails which had no electric power, had to be pushed back by passengers until the electric current line was regained.

* * *

Deputations of churchmen from the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist churches in the United States have been visiting the Philippine Islands in the interest of reconstructing their ruined work. Among the plans afoot are the construction of a union university in Manila and the expansion of the former Mary J. Johnson Hospital of the Methodists into a union enterprise with a medical school and nursery school as complementary agencies. It is said that the mission boards will spend upward of two million dollars in the rehabilitation of Protestant work.

—*Worldover Press.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXII FEBRUARY, 1947 No. 12

EDITORIAL

America should remember:

1. That with great power goes great responsibility. The temptations of power are such that only greatness of spirit can save a nation from its misuse. By the responsible use of power in behalf of just purposes—such as feeding the hungry, protecting the oppressed, and building a world order—America can enhance her greatness and extend her power. Otherwise she will miss her opportunity for greatness on an unprecedented scale.

2. That professions are validated by appropriate actions. The principles of our Declaration of Independence, our Bill of Rights, and our democratic creed of equality constitute exalted professions. But the tribunal of mankind will judge America not by these professions but by actions appropriate to them,—such as participation of all the citizens in the privileges and obligations of government, security of all the citizens in the right to earn a livelihood, equality before the law, and in general fairness and generosity in our customs and practices. Actions must correspond to professions.

3. That liberty is maintained by vigilance and propagated by pressure. America cannot afford to let up for a moment in resisting encroachments upon the area of liberty. Sinister forces are always at work, and must be constantly opposed. The pressure of public opinion—through organizations, means of communication and election machinery—is forever necessary to counteract intolerance and to press the claims of freedom.

4. That the patterns of the past are not sufficient for the plans of the future. America is growing in complexity and her problems are becoming increasingly acute. The patterns of a primitive economy will not meet the needs of today. Plans that our founding forefathers could not project—such as the T. V. A., the proposed M. V. A., and suggested schemes for the reorganization of urban life—require imagination and inventiveness that go beyond the simple patterns of early days. America's characteristic venturesomeness should not hesitate to tackle new problems in new ways.

5. That the world reputation of a great power is sensitive to every diplomatic move. America cannot afford to risk her reputation by gaining short-run advantages won by shrewd diplomacy at the cost of her long-run purposes in the building of a free world. The temperature of mankind responds quickly to the democratic integrity, or the lack of it, in America's international dealings. Every move of our State Department is anxiously watched and eagerly weighed in the capitals of the world. We must not depend on a rule-of-thumb policy in our international dealings. We must develop a policy that is consistent with democratic purposes and adhere to it in the counsels of the nations.

These are things that America cannot afford to forget.

Curtis W. Reese.

Pastor Martin Niemoeller: 1937-1947

LOUIS BINSTOCK

I had already heard a little about Pastor Martin Niemoeller before I once again entered Nazi Germany in the summer of 1937 after having had a brief glimpse of the beginnings of Hitler's Reich in the summer of 1933. The story of the "submarine pastor," as he was popularly called, was quite familiar to the majority of the Christian clergymen in our Sherwood Eddy party. On Sunday morning, June 27, a number of our group went out to attend services at his Dahlem Church in a suburb of Berlin. Shortly after we had been seated in the small, overcrowded sanctuary, a slight, middle-sized figure, gentle in manner, kind of face, mounted the altar. It was difficult to believe that this was really Martin Niemoeller. But no sooner had he begun to speak, his gaze sharp, serious, his lips set, determined, his voice full raised, his words clipped, distinct, his utterances unequivocal, forthright, there was not the slightest possibility of a mistake. This was indeed the man of God who had dared defy the Fuehrer himself. This was that brave spirit, still in his early forties, who had refused to compromise his conscience, who could not live a lie. Before the service was concluded, we witnessed a striking demonstration of the minister's courage and defiance when, despite a Nazi decree forbidding a church collection, and despite the presence of Hitler Jugend in the congregation stationed there to enforce the decree, Niemoeller nevertheless called for the collection, insisting that he would "render unto God the things that are God's."

The next morning, a large portion of our party, leaving the Hotel Central in twos and threes in order not to attract the attention of the Gestapo and not to endanger the welfare of our host, gathered at the home of Dr. Julius Richter who had been forced into retirement from leadership in the Theological Department of the University of Berlin. After listening to two brief addresses by the head of that wing of the Confessional Church which had been willing to make some compromise with the Nazis on the ground of patriotic necessity, and a distinguished professor who was introduced as the bravest and most faithful protagonist of religious freedom in Germany and who had already served a prison sentence for his refusal to accept Nazi doctrine, we again saw and heard Martin Niemoeller. This time it was in the intimacy and informality of a small room and a small company. In simple and unmistakable German, he told us how from his earliest childhood, the romantic, adventurous life had fascinated him; that he had always needed some holy cause which he might serve; some noble ideal for which he might sacrifice. During the first World War, despite the evils and horrors in which he had been compelled to participate, he had gloried in the opportunity to offer his life for the Fatherland which he loved. At that time he had not entertained any thought of becoming a preacher of God's word. Then came his country's humiliating defeat, his fellow countrymen's suffering and sorrow, his people's degradation and despair—and his anguished spirit turned to the Father of all for consolation and guidance. Soon he sensed the quality of romance to be found in the adventures of the soul, the glory of a life dedicated to the service of the Church. And so he became a preacher of the Gospel and a warrior of the Lord.

To him the issue was clear. The clash between the Church and the State grew out of only one basic, vital conflict, namely, whether the Church should be narrowly German or broadly universal in spirit and scope; whether it should include and minister only to those of Nordic Aryan blood and exclude all others or whether it should embrace in its membership all the children of men, irrespective of nationality or race or color or class. He had insisted that his must be the church universal, teaching and spreading the prophetic vision of the one fatherhood of God and the one brotherhood of man. He had fought against the proposed Aryan paragraph which had sought to oust the Jew from a place in the Church and which thus outlawed Jesus and Paul. He had refused to give up the Bible, the Old as well as the New Testament, which was the essential link binding him to his fellow Christians all over the world. He could not and would not accept the Nazi pagan philosophy as the foundation of his spiritual faith. Hence, he must continue to follow the commandments of the Gospel as revealed in the ancient sacred scriptures and not the commands of the Nazified Church Committee as issued by the new German state. Practically all the pastors of the Confessional Church had already been incarcerated. What would happen to him, he could not foresee. But of one thing he was certain, he assured us. He had taken his stand and he would not yield. And then he quoted from the New Testament: "And I say also unto Thee that Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." On this high note he concluded his address.

As we chatted informally, I took him aside and questioned him about his views concerning the German political situation and his opinions about the Nazi treatment of the Jews. We left as we had arrived—in groups of twos and threes—and that was the last I saw of Martin Niemoeller until January, 1947, in Chicago, Illinois. Four days later our party was on its way through Poland to Russia. Only when we came out of the land of the Soviets two weeks afterwards did we learn that on that very day, July 1st, when the train was taking us out of Germany, the "submarine pastor" was being taken to prison. Finally, the "gates of Hell" had closed about him and he was kept in concentration camps until his liberation in Italy in the summer of 1945.

We have only meager information concerning Niemoeller's experiences during those "concentration years." From 1937 to 1939 we caught occasional snatches—visits of his wife and children; transference from one camp to another; his steadfast refusal to purchase freedom for the price of his soul. From 1939 to 1945, we learned of the loss of his three sons on the field of battle and his holding of religious services at Dachau. From 1945 to 1947 we know of a number of speeches, his participation in some important Christian conferences, and his present speaking tour in the United States. Why, with such a background of seeming honesty and bravery, of apparent misfortune and martyrdom, should Pastor Niemoeller be the subject of so much controversy and the object of so much condemnation? Is there any foundation of fact for the various charges that have been levelled

against him? Can we trust his protestations of penitence and his preachments of peace?

When, on June 28, 1937, in Dr. Richter's home in Berlin, I engaged Niemoeller in private conversation, he revealed quite clearly his admiration for many of Hitler's accomplishments for the German people, if not entire acquiescence in all his attitudes and actions. He enthusiastically praised the Nazi totalitarian state for restoring to the nation its sense of unity, a feeling of self-respect, a place of power among the great nations of the earth. While deprecating the excesses and cruelties of the Fuehrer's domestic policies and appreciating the difficulties and dangers of his foreign programs, Niemoeller, at the same time, explained and excused too much—the "pogromming" of the Jews, the exterminating of the Labor and Socialist and Communist parties, the bullying of Poland and Czechoslovakia and other smaller countries; he saw Berlin flooded with two million Jews when there were only 650,000 in all of Germany, and saw the solution of the Jewish problem, as did Hitler, in their suppression and exclusion and humiliation. He was convinced that the dress of dictatorship rather than that of democracy best fitted the shape of the German future. He was aglow with the fiery vision of *Deutschland uber alles* which Hitler had once again kindled.

Rabbi Samuel Teitelbaum, who was Senior Chaplain of Southern Headquarters Peninsula Base Section when Niemoeller was liberated in Italy in the summer of 1945, talked with him almost daily over a period of weeks. He testifies that even after the eight years of hell, Niemoeller still evidenced an anti-Semitic bias, still revealed some of the typical German arrogance, and was still convinced that democracy did not suit the temper of the German people. Rabbi Teitelbaum charges that Niemoeller "is capable of placing the mark of respectability upon Nazism and Fascism. He is politically immature, either an upper class Nazi or a fellow-traveller of these reactionaries."

In his press interview last month in Chicago, Pastor Niemoeller denied that he had been at any time a member of the official Nazi party, but admitted that he had believed Germany's wagon hitched to Hitler's star might go very far—until from his window he watched the Storm Troopers' parade of triumph on the night of January 30, 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor of the Reich. He admitted that he had read *Mein Kampf* thoroughly before Der Fuehrer came to power but pleaded that he thought it was all just "campaign oratory." He admitted that at the beginning of the war, in 1939, he had offered his services to Admiral Raeder of the German Fleet, but avowed that his purpose was not to fight but to be freed in order that he might work toward a negotiated peace, for he recognized that in victory as well as in defeat Germany would be lost. He admitted that not only in his conversation with me in 1937 but even now he was of the opinion that the application of the *numerus clausus* to various vocations and professions was the only solution for anti-Semitism. It was only after a sharp pressing of the point that he finally agreed that this was unchristian and ungodlike, as it was unfair, and that it was a sin to discriminate against the Jew or any other people on the ground of creed or color or class. He admitted that he had at one time been taken in and thrilled by the Nazi totalitarian philosophy, except insofar as it challenged the authority of his beloved Church.

What shall we say about Martin Niemoeller? After ten years we see him physically less emaciated and harrowed than we had anticipated, but emotionally more mature and spiritually more sensitive. We see him as a man greatly handicapped in knowledge and understanding (he had very little formal education and cultural preparation before his entrance into the ministry), confused by long cherished prejudices, bewildered by complex world problems. We see him as a man still imprisoned by his German heritage of "higher" if not "lower" anti-Semitism, of racial provincialism, of national chauvinism; still limited in perception and vision because of his ignorance of fundamental forces and factors in the evolution of human history; still a neophyte in national and international economic, political, as well as religious, problems, primarily because he dwelt for eight years in a dungeon of darkness while fast-moving world events passed him by.

We see him as less haughty and more humble. We find his religious faith less sectarian and more truly universal. We believe him still brave and honest but bewildered and harassed. We hear him say that he is penitent but we wait to see that penitence put into practice. We appreciate his sympathy for the millions of Jews who are dead but we would appreciate more his acts of concrete sacrifice and service to promote the salvation of the millions of Jews who are still alive. We are willing to have him visit our democracy if he will take our vision of democracy and impart it to the people of Germany. We shall listen to his sermons if they result in heroic and glorious acts of social action in behalf not only of the German people but of all humanity.

Pastor Niemoeller—Saint or Nazi?

HOMER A. JACK

When Pastor Martin Niemoeller was flown to the United States early in December to address the biennial convention of the Federal Council of Churches, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt publicly charged that the German pastor had no quarrel with the Nazis politically and therefore she could not "quite see why we should be asked to listen to his lectures." Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, retiring President of the Federal Council of Churches and equally with Mrs. Roosevelt a foe of Fascism at home and abroad, immediately sent her a telegram expressing shock at her statement of "misinformation" about Niemoeller and asking that she issue a correction. So far she has not.

What manner of man is Pastor Niemoeller, one who evokes such opposite feelings in men of good will? Does he, as United States Army Chaplain Samuel Teitelbaum wrote in the *Congress Weekly* (Feb. 15, 1946), belong to that "dangerous segment of the German people, who may have opposed some of Hitler's methods, but who had no quarrel with his goal"? Or is he justly a martyr who is therefore being shepherded by the World Council of Churches and filling Protestant churches throughout the United States?

The events in Niemoeller's career are well-known.

He was a German submarine commander in the first World War. He refused to scuttle his ship at the end of the war, resigned from the navy, and worked on a farm. During the postwar years of inflation in Germany and its many discomforts, his thoughts turned to God and the Church. He studied for the ministry and soon was called to a church in Dahlem, a fashionable suburb of Berlin. No social actionist or even an intellectual, Niemoeller soon got into trouble with the advent of Hitler. He was first disciplined by the Nazis for writing an article in August, 1933, against certain of Hitler's early decrees against converted Jews (he is reported to have said at the time that if Jews were excluded from membership in the Christian Church, then Jesus and Paul would be excluded). The next year he preached against the blood purges in the Nazi party. In 1935 he was a leader of the Confessional Churches which publicly defied Hitler's ministers by urging the reading of banned proclamations. In 1937 he was arrested, and sent to a concentration camp as Hitler's "personal prisoner." There he languished in solitary confinement and was transferred in 1939 to the infamous Dachau camp where he remained until 1945. During his incarceration, three of his seven children were war casualties. Released by American occupation forces in Italy, he soon returned to Germany, became vice-president of the German Evangelical Church and its representative on the World Council of Churches, and, in an ecumenical capacity, talked in more than 186 towns in Germany within the past year.

Yet this is only part of the story of Martin Niemoeller. There is also a record of his acquiescence to much of Nazism. Chaplain Teitelbaum, who talked with Niemoeller often just after his release near Naples, called him a "refined" Nazi who "belonged to the Nazi party until 1937 and broke with Hitler only because of the latter's anti-Christianity and his ambition to establish the supremacy of the State over the Church." Karl M. C. Chworowsky, writing in UNITY (Sept. 1945) on "Exploding the Niemoeller Myth," said much the same thing: "Niemoeller was and is a Nazi. He has never clearly and consistently condemned the fundamental doctrines of National Socialism. When he was asked to say Heil Hitler to God, he gagged at that."

The truth about Niemoeller has not been easy to fathom. Admittedly it was unfair to base contemporary judgments on statements Niemoeller made at the American press conference just after he was released from eight years of imprisonment—and of having had the swift-moving political and even ecclesiastical world go by him for eight years. When Niemoeller first came to America the State Department forbade him to talk politics. But on January tenth in Chicago, a conference for the religious press was arranged—with no questions barred and no answers evaded. The short, spare, balding pastor—clearly showing signs of his incarceration—was accompanied by his wife, who occasionally nodded but did not speak during the interview (although she frequently spoke before American audiences and used good English as did her husband). Pastor Niemoeller's frank answers to one hour of questions put to him by everybody from the religious editor of the *Chicago Tribune* to an editor of the *Christian Century* are given here—but in telescoped form and with many sentences and phrases omitted:

"I was never a member of the Nazi party. Yet after the years of chaos around 1928 I began to believe in the propaganda of Nazism since there was no other way. I read *Mein Kampf*, but nobody took the book seriously. When I first came to Berlin I got the impression there were more Jewish people living there than German people. If a voluntary *numerus clausus* would have been instituted in the professions of medicine and law it would have lessened anti-Semitism.

"On the night of January 30, 1933, when Hitler came to power, my wife and I went into the streets and there saw the brown shirt battalions marching with torches and I realized a rope was being strung around our necks. My eyes were opened further when Hitler played false with the Church. Yes, my opposition to Hitler was religious, but religious opposition means ethical, social, political, and racial opposition.

"It is true I volunteered for service in the Nazi armed forces. In 1939 when I was in solitary confinement war broke out. If Hitler would win, this would mean total ruin for Germany. If Hitler would lose, this would also mean the total destruction of Germany—the Allies would tear her asunder. In those circumstances, what is a man going to do who loves his people? There was only one possibility left: Before the war would either be lost or won Hitler could be overthrown and a peace could be negotiated. My intention in 1939 was to do this and to do so I had to be outside a concentration camp. I then addressed a letter to my old acquaintance, General Admiral Raeder, and said that I would do my military duty as anybody else. Raeder did not dare answer the letter, gave it to Field Marshal Keitel who questioned Hitler about it and two months later Keitel wrote me that he regretted very much that they did not intend to make use of my services.

"The future of Germany belongs to that influence which first gets a decisive hold of the people's minds. Nihilism is dominant in Germany today, if by nihilism one means lack of direction. A minority of German youth cling to the remnants of National Socialism, but give them something else and these remnants will disappear. There is no anti-Semitism in Germany. By persecuting the Jews, Hitler uprooted anti-Semitism and there is only pity toward the Jews.

"Quite apart from the question of political Communism in Germany, there is a feeling of practical Communism throughout the country due to the effects of bombing and dislocation. For example, I have not slept in my own bed for nearly ten years now. I live as a fugitive and stranger in my own country. There is no probability that the lives of the majority of Germans will become normal again. The sense of property for us is gone. I possess only my tobacco pouch, my pipe, and the clothes I wear. Although there is public mention of these hardships, nobody mentions the hardships of the other nations in Europe which are due to us. The German people must recognize their guilt and see the need for reconciliation with all peoples . . ."

The following is from a sermon Niemoeller delivered in Chicago on January 9, 1947:

"We in Middle Europe can't enrich Americans with wealth or knowledge, but we have been endowed with spiritual experiences. The Church, which seemed to have been dead for decades, resisted Hitler and began to be filled again. How could Hitler silence the mouth of the Church? He tried to ban pastors from their congregations, but he only proved that the word of God can't be bound. He tried to put pastors in concentration camps, but never dared to do so on a large scale, and only imprisoned the pre-eminent cases. And instead of silencing the congregations, he put them to life. A living church suddenly arose. Hitler's greatest stu-

pidity was that he believed Jesus Christ was a dead person two thousand years ago. In Dachau we who worshipped were not bound by language or nation or creed. Now I know there is more than Lutheranism. Our human creeds can't bind the word of God. I have come to love the church universal."

Dr. Ewart Turner, Niemoeller's America companion and longtime friend as pastor in the American church in Berlin, defended Niemoeller to Chicago ministers recently by saying that "today Niemoeller is giving different answers." He is; and almost anybody who talks with Niemoeller cannot help but feel his are sincere answers. Niemoeller, for all his weaknesses, has not tried to conceal them from the public. And the impact is one of a bewildered, confused man—giving different answers, more democratic answers, but certainly not a well-integrated philosophy or program of democracy.

By American standards, Niemoeller is hardly the hero or martyr some would make us believe. Yet by German standards and considering his own limitations, Niemoeller cannot be ignored. He has grown out of a tradition of Prussian militarism, of Lutheran aloofness toward the things that are Caesar's, and of admitted personal sympathies to the Nazi regime. Yet he has not grown sufficiently to be of much use to the American people or the American churches. Most Americans start from a political position which Niemoeller has, with great effort, tentatively reached. Whatever public role there is for Niemoeller lies with his fellow churchmen in Middle Europe and with his fellow Germans: To lead the churchmen to enlarge their narrow concepts of creed and social action and to lead the German nation, together with secular liberals of broader democratic convictions, to social democracy and away from the growth of another wave of Fascism.

The Christian Century recently performed a valuable service in editorially urging Americans to play fair with Niemoeller. Yet we need not play gullible either. Niemoeller had courage, but so did many Nazis. We expect, in heroes, as Karl Chworowsky points out, "some degree of commitment to high ideals and a devotion to truth and decency"—not just courageous opposition to a tyrant. Yet in the case of Niemoeller, as with Kagawa of Japan, we must examine carefully the motives of some of those who would eagerly and unhesitatingly attack these men. *The Christian Century* has rightly pointed out that some desire to attack Niemoeller because his presence in America might jeopardize our keep-being-tough attitude toward Germany, since some Americans would see living witness to the fact that all surviving Germans are not Nazis. A second motive in the attack on Niemoeller (or Kagawa) is also patently political: smear those representing an emerging leadership block and the competing one will more easily assume power.

Yes, Mrs. Roosevelt was right. Niemoeller can teach us little except how difficult the job of democratizing Germany will be—and how men, least of all former Nazi sympathizers, are not Gods. But Bishop Oxnam was right, too, in implying that Niemoeller—for all his past—has sincerely outgrown Nazism and that there is the spirit of God in every man—including former Nazi sympathizers. Yet one must admit that the Christian Church in Middle Europe is in a sorry state if its best survivor is Martin Niemoeller, as one must conclude that the Christian Church in America is approaching spiritual bankruptcy if Martin Niemoeller is its greatest living inspiration.

Protestantism's German Saint

DELOS O'BRIAN

I heard Pastor Martin Niemoeller speak twice, and Mrs. Niemoeller once, in San Francisco, and each time I came away shocked and disturbed.

I was evidently not the only one, for comments like these could easily be overheard as the crowds dispersed: "I expected him to censor Hitler." "Why did he say nothing about the Nazi persecution of the Jews?" "I wasn't prepared for that, but then maybe they went through so much that they cannot bear to tell the real story."

Questions like these bothered me, too, and still do, but I was disturbed not so much by the omissions as by the implications of what the German pastor and his wife said.

Mrs. Niemoeller's lengthy talk was devoted entirely to a day-by-day description of her visits to Pastor Niemoeller during his imprisonment. The general impression that she gave, even of the dread Dachau, was not particularly unfavorable to the Nazis.

Of course she spoke of the hardship of having her husband imprisoned, and told, with some emotion, the story of her long, tiring trips to and from the prison. Sometimes on these journeys she was even under bomb attack—our bombs, though she did not mention that. An experience like this, we will admit, was very difficult for a lone woman who was trying to keep a large family together, while at the same time paying regular visits to her husband. Her son was fighting with the Germans on the Eastern Front. A trying experience, yes, but how many other wives or relatives were given the privilege of visiting their kin in the Nazi concentration camps? Mrs. Niemoeller's pretty tale about the "holy supper" that the Nazis permitted her and her husband to enjoy together was, to say the least, surprising. They were ushered into a gaily decorated room, and spread before them was a bountiful meal. Pastor Niemoeller even came bearing a bottle of choice wine for the occasion—not the usual treatment accorded the victims in the dread and horrible Dachau.

This, and much more perhaps, is explained by two asides made by the German pastor during the discourses that I heard. "I was, of course," he said, "a special prisoner." And about the Commandant of the hellish concentration camp of Dachau, Niemoller informed us, "He was always very cordial to me, always."

Cordiality, however, is certainly not one of the characteristics of Pastor Niemoeller's tour of America. Ewart Turner is the pastor's guide, bodyguard, and general handyman on this tour. I have known Turner for years and, so, when I saw the trio—Turner, Niemoeller, and Mrs. Niemoeller—in a San Francisco hotel lobby at the close of one of their appearances, I attempted to speak to them.

To my complete amazement, I practically gave them hysterics. When I spoke to him, Turner jumped as if

he had seen a ghost. He blurted out a hostile, "Hello." Swiftly he grabbed his charges, the two Niemoellers, and rushed them toward the elevator. He shoved them unceremoniously into it and disappeared.

I was so surprised by this performance that it took several minutes for me to recover my thoughts. Then I went to the telephone and called the Niemoeller rooms. I wanted to learn, if possible, why this sudden delirium of fright. It took several minutes to get through. The operator was reluctant to ring the Niemoeller suite and, once I got it, a woman demanded to know who I was and what my business was about. I told her that I was a friend of Ewart Turner's and that I only wished to talk with him for a moment. After much persuasion and several long delays, I finally found myself listening to the voice of Ewart Turner.

"Hello," he said, "who are you, and what do you want?"

I gave him my name, and said that I did not actually want much of anything, only a chance to ask him a couple of questions.

In answer to my inquiry about his flight from the hotel lobby a few moments before, he said that it was his duty to protect the Niemoellers' health. It seemed that meeting people was, in his estimation, the worst thing in the world for their health. I suggested that I come up and talk with him. That was impossible, also, not for reasons of health, but because he was simply so busy—but how did I like the lecture?

"Well," I said, "I missed several words that are very familiar to all Americans: 'Liberty, Freedom, Democracy, Liberation,' etc."

"Yes," but countered Mr. Turner, "don't you think it is much more effective to preach freedom and democracy indirectly without mentioning the actual words?"

I had to admit that I did not—that I liked the old American custom of talking right out in public about Freedom and Democracy! I hung up!

It was obvious that nobody was going to question the Niemoellers or Turner either, if he could help it.

At each of the meetings that I attended careful precautions were taken to prevent anyone from indulging in the good American habit of asking questions. At one meeting the audience was asked to stand in prayerful silence while the Niemoellers left the room. At another a big limousine waited, with rear door open, at the back entrance of the church, and whisked the Niemoeller party away in a flash as the meeting ended.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is sponsoring the Niemoeller tour of America. Why is the Council risking its reputation in this way? Very few people are going to be deceived by the disservice to democracy done by the former U-boat captain's appearance in America.

We must assume that since the Federal Council is sponsoring this speaking tour it is willing to accept responsibility for the kind of world Niemoeller hopes to establish. Here is a description of that world in the German's own words. He tells us that he is striving to bring peace. "Not peace for ALL mankind," he warns, "but peace for those who are reconciled to God according to God's plan!" The doctrine of peace for the elect is too much like the doctrine of peace for the Master race only! A future that offers peace and prosperity to only one people, whether they be Hitler's, Niemoeller's, or the Federal Council's people, is a future that is bound to result in failure and sorrow and disaster. If the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has lost faith in the universal brotherhood of man, and if it is coming out for one-half a world, then it is aiming at the end of the world. For, if in this atomic age we cannot create peace for ALL mankind, we cannot create peace for anybody!

The Minister's Responsibility for Social Action

JOHN G. MacKINNON

My brother has spent twenty-two years as a rubber chemist in industry. During seventeen years of that time he was constantly irked by the fact that a rubber chemist in industry has a large degree of responsibility and no authority. It is his job to see that processes go right in the factory, but he has no power to enforce his ideas. Finally, however, my brother came to the conclusion that this irksome situation was a good thing. It developed certain valuable qualities in the rubber chemist. One of these was a skill in personal relations since he had to secure the fulfilling of his instructions by consent rather than by command. Another was a far greater carefulness in his work; for the decisions he made had to be right since they must be sold on their merits rather than ordered by sheer authority.

The minister in the social action field, and perhaps in many other fields, is in a similar situation. Perhaps he could be said to be in an even more difficult one. He has a large responsibility for social action, but he operates not only without authority, but under authority.

His responsibility springs from nothing but his own social conscience. His salary will not suffer; his position with his people will not suffer—save in a few rare churches—if he takes no social action at all. The responsibility laid upon him does not come from financial need or the expectations of his congregation; but only from his own sense of obligation to the social problem of civilization.

The authority under which he operates is the authority of the congregation which employs him. It may, though rarely, be exerted in the form of financial pressure. It is most frequently present in the form of a sense of obligation to the group of people who employ him, and to the institution to which he has chosen to give his time and strength. His own conscience makes him constantly aware of his obligation to those people and that institution. Often there are times when these two obligations do not run parallel; indeed they sometimes pull in opposite directions.

There are certain positions that ministers and churches should take on the race problem, the labor problem, the political problem, and the international problem. But let us be realistic. Not more than 5 per cent of my church membership would agree on these matters. With a very few notable exceptions, the same is true of other churches. To push these matters insistently in local churches is to follow a program that does not have the support of 95 per cent of church members.

The question which concerns my mind and spirit is how far we can go in fulfilling our sense of responsi-

bility for social action at the cost of disrupting, antagonizing, and offending the church membership. How far can the responsibility to social action be fulfilled if it violates the other responsibility to our people and our institution?

A few considerations to be taken into account in trying to decide this problem might be listed. A few weeks ago a splendid woman of ninety-three—a lifetime pillar of my present church—told me a story. Some thirty years ago this church, which had one Negro member and a couple of Negro attendants, faced the problem of the request for admission of three Negro children into the church school. The lay leaders of the church school, of whom this woman was one, made the decision to admit the children. The result was that the church school fell apart for a generation; primarily from the social pressure of others in the community not connected with the church. The decision was right, of course, but the consequences to the church and to the people in it were not good.

There is a very real danger of wrecking or damaging our institutions by following our social consciences with single-minded zeal. It is sometimes said that if a church cannot take constructive social action on the race problem—and by implication upon all others—it would better not exist. Do we really mean that? Must we have a perfect church or none? Or do we recognize the church as an imperfect institution, which we believe is improvable, and one through which we can work for the greater human good?

A thirst for martyrdom on the part of ministers is also a very dangerous thing for churches. For those who have a stomach for martyrdom—which I confess I do not—there should be no objection to their going the martyr's road—if they could go alone. Unhappily they take unwilling martyrs along with them in the form of their congregations. There are times, of course, when martyrdom is inescapable, save at the loss of all integrity and principle. We might all have to endure it; but to seek it for its own sake is to deal unfairly with the group of people and the institution we serve.

One ought, also, to be very certain that he is right to take and force an unequivocal position. I wish I knew what was right with the unswerving certainty exhibited by some people. Too often I do not. Too often I am acutely aware that people of good will and effective minds arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions. Most of us and our laymen can agree in general upon things that are wrong in society. But we arrive at different solutions. I feel that one must be very certain that he is right before taking action. Perhaps it is the same obligation that is laid upon my brother in the rubber-chemistry field—the obligation of being above reproach in our conclusions. Not only must we be sure that we are right in theory; we ought to be as sure as is humanly possible that the results of the action we propose will be beneficial instead of the contrary.

We ministers sometimes are in danger of "popping off" prematurely. There is the danger of wishing to do or say something dramatic on a burning issue of the day. Recently I circulated a petition in my church. I like to circulate petitions and to demonstrate my power in the pulpit by getting my congregation to sign them. This petition was sent by the Unitarian Commission on World Order, concerning La Guardia's United Nations food fund. It came late in the week when my sermon was in preparation. It looked good to me and I slapped it into my sermon and invited my congregation to sign. A few weeks later my treasurer, a fine gentleman, called on some different business and gave me incidentally three columns from the current press by well-known columnists, presenting the other side. He was even gentleman enough not to chide me; but to wonder why the World Order Commission took hasty positions like it did. I realized, somewhat humiliated, that I had let my flair for the dramatic lead me into a too-hasty and ill-considered pronouncement and action on a question which I had not examined fully.

The minister's responsibility for social action is something which he cannot escape. How shall he fulfill it, and at the same time fulfill his responsibility to his institution? He should preach on social subjects. He will run less risk of alienating his congregation when they disagree with him that way than in any other. Freedom in itself entails the responsibility of care. The minister should preach as his conscience directs; but he should be sure that he knows his subject and that he has considered all sides and reached his conclusion by no half-baked assumption of his own rightness.

He should act in the community as an individual citizen, in those social matters which touch his conscience. In this he has less freedom than an independent person, for he must recognize that no matter how loudly he proclaims that he acts only for himself, he cannot completely dissociate himself from his church. And he must never officially commit his church without its democratically-arrived-at consent. He has more freedom than many employees of industry and business, because as church people his members, too, have social consciences.

The minister should try to create organizations within his church of lay people who will take social action in the name of their organizations. This is the best way to channelize the social concern of a church; but one which meets varying success in different churches and under different ministers. It is perhaps one of the best ways by which the minister can implement his social zeal.

We cannot expect too much, for we have this strange two-fold loyalty. And we work for a strange sort of institution. Its vast majority of members are socially, politically, and economically conservative. But because they, too, have a sense of social obligation to the wrongs and maladjustments of society, they offer a haven to a social prophet. In spite of their social, economic, and political conditioning they give us a means of livelihood, continue to pay our salaries while we prophesy and act contrary, in many cases, to their convictions. I believe we have no right, in an excess of single-minded social zeal, to sell these people down the river or to destroy their institution and ours.

Our Gods Live in Hollywood

Our gods live in Hollywood—
They are comical gods,
Grinning in cheerful derision
Of that old preacher, Truth;
And tall technicolor maids
Are the angels who serve;
Fantasy lures us to movies,
Straight past the polling booth. . . .
And we offer our dollars there
To the carnival gods,
Seeing the glitter we cherish
In the side show, not the main tent—
In the spectacle not the event.

MANFRED A. CARTER.

Social Action

PHILIP SCHUG

In my estimation no phase of church activity does so much to keep a congregation attuned to the ongoing life of a community as social or community action. That is not to say that social action is the most important phase of church life. Such an assertion, in my opinion, does violence to any well-rounded view of a Unitarian Church as an organic part of a community in which teaching, fellowship, speculative, and other functions are parts of the whole along with social action. This organic view in which the church fits into the community and the parts of the church program fit together into a unitary social structure avoids many of the pitfalls of efforts to boom one of the functions of the church to the neglect of the others. It can also provide normative structures for estimating the health and possibilities of a church at any one time.

It seems important at the outset to understand that social action connotes a host of possibilities from a type of genteel philanthropy aimed at quieting one's conscience to social revolutions in the community. Thus the social action possibilities of a church may be a happy hunting ground for people of varying inspirations and capacities. Special dangers and possibilities for tremendous change must be carefully watched. The overbalancing of the church program in the direction of social action would seem to be a fruitful source of danger to the life of the institution, though this is probably a rare occurrence in Unitarian circles. Poorly considered social action carried forward by a few especially zealous people probably gives more trouble.

It is probably not too strong to say that no Unitarian church should be without some ongoing program in this field. If we may assume this we may then take up some of the special problems involved in carrying forward a lively program that is healthy for the life of the institution.

It would appear to me that most churches should have special committees to deal with social action problems rather than to attempt to handle these problems as a committee of the whole. The reasons for this are these: Not all people are interested nor do they all have the temperamental qualities necessary to buck the line in community controversy. Some people are just too busy to take part in the more time-consuming activities of the church, and it appears that effective community action takes time. But an even more important reason to me is the consideration of efficiency and effectiveness. When relatively small committees deal with specific problems, lines of responsibility are clear, and I, at least, do not find the sagging morale that has been noticed in large groups of fifty or more. Decisions can be executed quickly. Accomplishments of small committees seem to be enjoyed almost as much by people who have an interest but are not a part of the committees as by those who do the work on a specific job. In many respects the subdivision of interests, problems, and responsibilities of people who are interested in social action in general seems to be excellent. So long as the categories are relatively elastic or can be easily changed it would seem that any special problem could be handled in this way.

It would seem to me that authority to act and to carry through projects should be assumed to be a right of any social action committee within a church. This should not necessitate reference to the congregation as a whole, for if such reference and review were necessary before a committee took concrete steps on a project much time would be lost, attempts would be made either to tone down the program to the point where it was unoffensive to anyone, or to railroad the plans through by rustling up votes and engaging in inter-organizational politics that could easily give rise to tensions and schisms. Far to be preferred is the freedom of thought and action of a committee that can act, understands that it is an important part of the church, and that its action will be interpreted by the community to be the action of the church as a whole with benefits or detriments accruing to the organization as a whole regardless of certain frictions that may exist within the group to the contrary. No committee, of course, should be able to legally bind the whole church.

This emphasis upon special committees made up of people especially interested and able to act should not be construed to mean that the church as a whole should not have any control over the committees or that the church as a whole should not be consulted or asked to cooperate from time to time. The activities of committees should be faithfully reported at rather frequent intervals as a caution against the growth of rumors and nightmares of misinformation. This can probably be done by mail more profitably than in special meetings. On occasions such as annual meetings or quarterly suppers the entire congregation should be entitled to oral reports and be privileged to question and discuss any program or committee action. These safety valves should be helpful to the congregation, and the responsibility to report and face critical inquiry should be sufficient to make any committee survey its programs and attitudes constructively. The minister should consider it his duty to maintain an atmosphere of generous respect for the efforts of all groups within the fellowship. That this will probably be a more difficult task in regard to social action groups than for recreational, educational, or other more academic groups seems obvious.

The problem of whether the church should ever act as a committee of the whole cannot be left without some consideration of petitions. In my estimation petitions are of very little value except in cases where a specific local action seems to be stalled and a show of strength is deemed necessary to move some person or group to action. The people to be moved to action should know the names of many of the signers on sight, and they should be respected to the extent that the petition should be presented with a notarized statement that a certain person or persons observed the writing of the signatures and believes every one to be genuine. The wholesale signing of petitions under supervision that cannot be checked by those who receive the petitions is not recommended. Nor is it recommended that a minister or congregation feel any special obligation to circulate the many petitions that come to a minister's or clerk's desk. This sort of exercise might possibly be placed under the heading of social activity but it hardly measures up to the requirements of social action. With this caution in mind it should also be mentioned that some widely distributed petitions may have value, especially if they do nothing else than raise questions within the group concerning local conditions.

In my estimation the fictions so strenuously maintained by some religious bodies that they do not dabble in politics may have some value for their memberships, especially if the members are deluded in a rather general way so far as their church is concerned, but it seems unnecessary for a Unitarian congregation to waste time on such fictions. Almost any social action which does more than bind up the wounds of those who are hurt by social injustices will run square into politics at every turn. Social action that seeks to correct inequities and social cruelties cannot avoid politics—and it need not scare anyone. Much effective social action uses present officeholders of local, state, or national governments. Very often a show of political strength is necessary to get an officeholder to act in accordance with the clearly stated duties of his office. It has aptly been said about public officeholders that appear to have never heard about their duties that getting action from them is a matter of building a hotter fire under them than someone else builds. Social action on the local church level may be almost wholly concerned with local politics at times, for the importance of getting socially-minded officeholders is almost impossible to exaggerate. A committee which sees the needs, counts the costs of failure, has some knowledge of its strength, and has determination to do battle, should receive the blessings of the congregation, which, if it is fully informed, will probably cheer quite loudly and later assert, "We did it," as it merges its committee actions with its total program and accomplishments.

It seems to me to be ideal for the minister to work through committees wherever possible in order to accomplish a social action project. This is not said from the standpoint of protecting the minister so much as from the standpoint of multiplying his energies. As the professional head of his institution he has responsibility for the total program of the church. He will find that the health of his church depends upon his balance of activities to a certain extent, though he may have special interests and talents which will justify spending a greater portion of his time in some one field than in any other or than in any combination of several fields. Yet, he must spend his hours wisely. If he takes on some specific social action job by himself it seems to stand to reason that he should give at least as much consideration to the job and its possibilities for his institution as a committee would give. He should also give reports and stand for criticism as a committee would be expected to do.

The minister should see possibilities to accomplish reforms, civic projects, and anything that can be labeled social action through written and spoken discourses. Some are more successful than others at moving people to action, but a clear-cut problem well-presented, with some hint of possible solution or some outline to follow, should not always be neglected as a sermon possibility. The sermons on committee decisions, actions, or knotty problems seem to be quite wise from more than just the social action emphasis point of view. It is also "a natural" as an interest-getter in the local congregation, and what minister is wholly uninterested in attendance figures?

Regardless of ideal schemes of social action or the lack of them, skills or the lack of them in this field, and either large or small numbers interested, it would seem that Unitarian churches, more than any others of which I know, should be interested in creating and enjoying the good life here and now. Social action on the local level is one way of working toward this goal, and it is a source of many satisfactions that straight teaching, golfing, or "teaing" cannot give.

A True Church

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

A church should offer to people a center for the highest expression of their truest selfhood. It should reach forth to encompass them, whatever their age or condition. It should set them free to soar beyond all they recognize as less than their best. It should make them warm and comfortable while at the same time it inspires them to concern and commitment.

Thus can we put into solid words the answer vaguely sifting through us as we face the question: Why the church?

This much we know, the true church should do a great deal for people. But there is not a chance that this "great deal" will be done as if by miraculous accident. We must work at this business of the church and be conscious every minute of why we are working at it.

When a stranger walks into the auditorium of a true church on Sunday morning, and feels the quiet, sustaining strength of its atmosphere, his sentiments are not coincidental. They are the fruit of a wedding of factors built of human effort. He feels as he feels because the people in that true church have all worked hard at putting a wealth of spiritual quality into their time together. It is the product of understanding and caring for each other's needs. It is the product of those whose love and devotion has been poured into the very concrete foundation of the building itself. It is the product of all those who now serve that they may be served.

There are really no limits to what the true church should do for people; no limits, that is, except those which people themselves impose. And even here the true church should not easily be deterred, but should work away at false limitations, patiently, ever-patiently—but also ever-doggedly.

People serve the institution. The institution serves people. And yet, people *are* the institution. We are tempted to hold high a pontifical hand, and declare this relationship to be a mystery. But, of course, it is not really a mystery any more than it is a mystery that within the same human heart there can be courage and cowardice, love and hate, strength and weakness, joy and gloom.

So, the true church as an institution, though it be made up of those of us who are often cowardly, hateful, weak and gloomy, is yet the living community of courage, love, strength, and joy.

The infallible test of a true church is whether or not people feel free to bring into it their deepest problems and their darkest depressions, and there be touched by light and energized by hope.

If there is one thing that the ministry teaches a man, it teaches him that people are lonely. It impresses upon

him, until his soul is shriven, that the great emotional problem of the human race to which he belongs is the problem of loneliness. He sees it behind every mask of viciousness and deceit. He sees it now as fear, now as animosity, now as guilt. He sees it in those who push, and in those who run away. He sees it in his young people, in his young couples, in those who are at the peak of mature vigor, and in the aged. He wishes that he were ten men instead of one, and that there were ten times twenty-four hours in a day so that he might have more time to think, more time to speak, more time to act on this all-pervading problem of human loneliness.

He sees in the true church an avenue of hope, a channel of grace, a wondrous gleam flashed by those who would pool the best that is in them, that such a common pillar of strength might serve always to overcome the worst that is in them. He sees in the true church the "more stately mansion" of those souls who have caught sight of an escape from loneliness.

Some of Our Best Friends Are Gentiles

I. ALLEN

At last after long years of suffering we Jews who remained alive can breathe more easily in the realization that the greatest Jewish enemies—also, and not by coincidence, world enemies—have paid their full price. However, with the blood-drenched earth still wet and the lament of the innocent urchins still in our ears, how can we, how dare we, rejoice?

Man's inhumanity to man, and the callousness our alleged friends all over the world displayed vis-a-vis the greatest debacle of organized decency perpetrated by the fiendish Hitlerite gangs and their satellites against the helpless and hapless Jewish men, women, and children, whose only crime was that they could offer no resistance, are without parallel in modern history. True, this was not the first time in Jewish history that they were being victimized. The history of the Jewish people since they were driven out of Palestine is written in blood. They suffered from political persecution, and later, since the advent of Christianity, from religious persecution; and in modern times every demagogue and megalomaniac who seeks to advance his personal fortune finds it profitable to make the Jew the scapegoat for every conceivable social malady. Such a charlatan offers a simple panacea: By eliminating the Jewish "influence" everything will be all right.

What can the Jews offer in rebuttal? Reason? Facts? Men of the calibre of Hitler, Rosenberg, Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith, and others do not appeal to reason. They appeal to passion. They know from past experience that, although one cannot fool all the people all of the time, it is enough to fool some of the people most of the time. There are always malcontents, ne'er-do-wells, who hide their lack of success by blaming the other fellow.

In this article, however, I am not concerned with those elements. What irks me is the fact that it is not always the ignorant and the ones who see in the elimination of the Jew—either economically or physically—their own welfare, who are easily won over to the "cause" of anti-Semitism. Many non-Jews who have social contact with Jews, and who testify under questioning that some of their best friends are Jews, are also easy converts. Apparently our allegedly high state of civilization failed miserably in raising man's moral and spiritual level.

With all our technical advancement, with all our religious preaching that all men are created in the image of God, and with all our democratic teachings that all men are created equal, the basic and undeniable fact is that it is much easier to teach men to hate than to teach them to love. For man is still primitive in spite of his light veneer of education. Hate requires no mental effort. One does not have to think in order to hate. In his selfish "I" he only sees himself and is easily led astray by promises of megalomaniacs. Love, on the other hand, is noble. In order to love, one's own personality has to be submerged. Love sometimes requires personal sacrifice. In order to love, one must think not of himself, but of his associates.

This apparently is too much to ask in this Atomic Age. To ease their consciences and atone for their sins, individuals and nations sometimes make a noble gesture of good will. But this is not enough. Speeches and charity do not solve anything.

Let me illustrate: Hitler and the Nazis liquidated over a half-million Jews in Germany, before the war. Where, oh where, was humanity! What happened to those noble Christian souls, those democratic leaders of the world? Did they lift a finger in defense of the Jews, not with love and pity for the Jews, but to prevent that dreadful disease of hate and intolerance from spreading all over the whole world? Let us imagine a German sentry shooting a French sentry across the frontier. Most likely it would have been a *causus belli*. Murdering a half-million innocent victims, however, was no concern to the rest of the world. Please do not tell me that the world knew nothing about Dachau and other murder factories. If it did not, the diplomats who were entertaining and being entertained by Hitler, whom nobody can accuse of being subtle, were just plain Charlie McCarthys whose only purpose was to amuse Der Fuehrer.

The truth is that in their desire to appease the forces of evil, they overlooked the cold-blooded massacre of hundreds of thousands of fellow beings. The best that the Christians—to whom the Jews gave Christ—did was to utter some half-hearted expressions of pity.

The Jews seek neither pity nor charity. All we ask is to be left alone. All we say to the non-Jew is: Do not praise us, but also do not blame us for sins committed by others.

Jews are accused of everything under the sun. Jews are war-mongers, international bankers, cowards, swindlers, disloyal!

Now, let us glance at the record of the world at large. Let us take such non-Jewish names and events as Hannibal, Caligula, Caesar, Genghis Khan, the Mongol invasion, the Turkish invasion of Europe, the Barbarians, the German "Kultur" centers such as Buchenwald, Dachau, the gas chambers. Or take, for instance, such non-Jewish bankers and industrialists, whose influence is spread throughout the world, as Montague Norman, formerly of the Bank of England, the Morgans, Krupp, Thyssen, Schneider-Crusot, Big Steel, Wall Street, Pall Mall, Standard Oil. Obviously Jews were not responsible in these situations.

Talking about "Jewish cowards," we must start with Bar Kohba, and go down the line to Sergeant Levin, who was with Colin Kelly of Pearl Harbor fame; General Rose who was killed in Germany; the Jewish chaplains who risked their lives to bring comfort to both Jew and non-Jew; the American- and Russian-Jewish commanders and men who defended Stalingrad and drove the Germans back to Berlin.

Jews are "parasites," who take advantage of the "hospitality" accorded them and give nothing in return! Men like Heine, Lessing, Mendelssohn, Franz Werfel, Einstein, Disraeli, Morgenthau, Brandeis. What have they contributed to civilization? Can they compare with such "humanitarians" as Himmler, Streicher, Coughlin? Did Einstein's efforts help to perfect the gas chambers of Tremblinka, or other torture instruments? Every honest sociologist must admit that Jewry has contributed far more generously to civilization and progress, both before and after Christ, than they have taken in return.

Yes, I admit, that the Jews are internationalists. They believe in One World. They have given Monotheism and Christ to the whole world. Einstein and Spinoza and Heine belong to the whole world. The Old Testament and the Ten Commandments, though the products of Jewish "degeneracy," were given to the whole world. The fact that the world repudiated their noble teachings is not the fault of the Jew.

Hitler persecuted the Jews because they gave the World the New Testament, the basis of moral living. Did this prevent such Catholic countries as Poland, Slovakia, and Hungary from following gladly in Goebel's footsteps? The brutal fact of the matter is that such high Catholic officials as Cardinal Hlond, the primate of Poland, even without Hitler's prompting, aided and abetted anti-Semitism. In 1936, for instance, in a pastoral letter, he declared:

> It is an actual fact that the Jews fight the Catholic church [what a shamefaced lie], they are freethinkers, and constitute the vanguard of atheism, bolshevism, and revolution. The Jewish influence upon novels is fatal, and their publishers spread pornographic literature. It is also true that the Jews are practising usury.

And then, following the Coughlin line, he added, as if to sweeten somewhat his version, "Not all the Jews are, however, like that." As to commercial boycotts, he stated: "One does well to prefer one's own kind of commercial dealings and to avoid Jewish stores, but it is not permissible [sic!] to demolish Jewish businesses. One should boycott the Jewish Press."

Nor is this an isolated case. The Roumanian Iron Guards were given support by Father Hlinka, while the Slovak's Father Tisza worshipped Fascism in his country. In these United States we have a notorious Father Coughlin and Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, who openly espouse the cause of reaction and anti-Semitism. In addition to these two rabble-rousers, there are many "Christian" organizations whose only aim in life is to exterminate the Jews. Is it not the function of the Church to tame such culprits? Why is it that Father Orlemanski, who went to Moscow in behalf of Poland, was severely disciplined while Father Coughlin received a half-hearted admonition by the late Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago?

In summing up my case for the Jews, I emphatically reject the advice given us by our "Judaeo-Christian" evangelists to "embrace" our Jesus and all our sins will be forgiven. I reject it, because it is not only stupid but also cowardly. Anti-Semitism does not stem from the fact that the *Jews* reject Christ. It is the fact that the *Christians* do. Did Streicher's "Christian" heart bleed for the fact that the Jews do not accept Jesus? Or was Rosenberg, the Nazi "philosopher," so incensed at the Jew's rejection of Christ that he ordered the purification of their souls by means of crematoria?

Furthermore, where is the logic; yes, and where is the justice? Our Jewish and Christian apostles do not deny that Jesus was a Jew and that Christianity is of Jewish origin. Would it not be more correct to urge the Christians to incorporate the Jewish theology in their religion and practise universal brotherhood?

Perhaps I am mistaken but it seems to me that it is the non-Jew who is persecuting the Jew, whether out of his "love" of Christianity or otherwise, and not vice versa. Who established the Holy Inquisition and the Crusades?

The Jewish religion is the only religion that has no missions. Our only concern is to be left alone.

The Jew seems to be the barometer of our civilization. The welfare of the Jew is inextricably bound with that of the rest of mankind. Anti-Semitism is usually the forerunner of reaction. Consequently the only way to rid the world of the plague of anti-Semitism is to rid the world of reaction.

The Study Table

Moral Absolutes

ETHICAL IMPERATIVES. *By David Saville Muzzey. New York: American Ethical Union. 57 pp. 25c.*

The Ethical Culture movement has its own trinity. We use this phrase because Muzzey gives to his three ethical imperatives the status of absolutes even though spelled with a little "a". These imperatives are (1) the worth of the individual, (2) the supremacy of the ethical ideal, and (3) the community of seekers after righteousness.

In his first chapter on "The Worth of the Individual" Muzzey meets the dilemma created in affirming the supreme worth of each individual in the face of obvious moral and ethical inequalities, by drawing a neat distinction between "worth" and "value." "Values are graded and measurable. Worth is an absolute conception, incommensurable with any standards of value." He then goes on to bolster this belief in the worth of man by presenting certain psychological, historical, and even political justifications. However, he concludes with the observation that there is no scientific evidence and that "the ethical postulate of the worth of man is an act of faith."

The imperative of the Ethical Ideal is summed up in the phrase, "harmonious life," *sans* greed, pride, envy, and hate. This, too, becomes an absolute in that it must be accorded supremacy. From it we must draw our understanding of morals and morality. Muzzey laments the confusion between morals and customs, drawing the distinction between them on the basis of individual responsibility—"the essence of ethics." Complete devotion to the ethical ideal is necessary because it is "as absolute as the sovereignty of Calvin's God, as absolute as the sun in the solar system."

The third ethical imperative is the Community of the Seekers after Righteousness. The building of such a community is the "prime duty" of a member of the Ethical Culture Society. In such a community only can man attain his true moral stature. It is not a community of the righteous but of seekers after righteousness. This is an eternal and never-ending quest to become "makers of understandings." Righteousness cannot be achieved, for it is not a state or condition into which one enters but rather the process of seeking, the determined effort to improve oneself and society. Man achieves civic maturity only as a member of the community and moral stature only as a member of an ethical community.

In this book one finds man of absolute worth, guided by an absolute ideal, engaged in an absolute quest. We wonder why Muzzey felt it necessary to deal in the realm of absolutes and abstractions, and why he seemed to avoid the relativity and tentativeness which come from a thoroughly naturalistic and scientific approach. We question the extrapolations which he makes, both as to their necessity and reality—but with complete recognition of the importance and significance of his ethical concepts.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

Jewish Influence on Rembrandt

REMBRANDT, THE JEWS AND THE BIBLE. *By Franz Landsberger. Translated from the German by Felix M. Gerson. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 189 pp., including 66 illustrations. $3.00.*

It is understandable that one who is hated looks at himself and into himself to discover why. If he is not too sure of his own estimate of himself, he will seek out those who do not despise him, and particularly one who is his friend, to tell him if he deserves to be disliked. Fortunate is he if he learns that he is worthy, that he is respected and held in deep, profound affection.

If he is a Jew, who is often hated and frequently subjected to discrimination and monstrous persecution, the need becomes imperative to be reassured that he "belongs" and that he possesses qualities of character and culture that earn him a place in society. Thus it is that the great master, Rembrandt, became the avenue through which Franz Landsberger could assert to intelligent men that the Jew through his appearance, his way of life, and his works has had a profound and positive influence upon his fellow men and any society of which he is a part.

For Rembrandt lived with the Jews in his adopted Amsterdam and drew deeply from his close relationship with them and from the dramatic and epic stories of the Bible. Mr. Landsberger tells what a comfort it has been to him "in this era of European Jewish tragedy, to dwell upon the life and work of Rembrandt." It is especially so since Rembrandt was a man of Germanic ancestry. He did not regard Jews as a "misfortune." He approached them with friendly sentiments, lived with them and painted them as he found them. His familiarity with the Bible influenced his works and creative powers immeasurably and was throughout his life, whether in affluence or poverty, (and it should be noted that this was pretty much the order in his financial affairs) a source of inspiration. He constantly resorted to Biblical themes as subjects for his paintings and etchings, and he had the courage to be the first to use the Jews of his environment as models for them, whether as heroes or in incidental roles.

Mr. Landsberger makes no effort to approach Rembrandt, the artist, critically. Rather, his sole interest lies in presenting Rembrandt, the citizen of the world, as he saw and loved the Jew and was inspired by him. True it is, that Rembrandt was the artist in the greatest sense of the word; and, as the artist, he imbued his works with an intensity of feeling, beauty, and profundity that very few artists in the long history of man have equalled. It is axiomatic that the work of art is always the artist himself. Nevertheless, that a group or community of people, its history, legends, and manners can be the spark to kindle the flames of genius is a tribute of the greatest importance; and if the Jew does not require tribute to survive and continue the struggle with his non-Jewish neighbor for a world without fear, discrimination, lynching, and pogrom, at least it is good that the friendly non-Jew sees him for what he is, a person with dignity, culture, sometimes deeply religious, sometimes not, gay and sad, sometimes brilliantly clear and more often confused—in other words, a human being.

There are a large number of reproductions in Mr. Landsberger's book and they are effectively used to illustrate some of the community, both people and places, in which Rembrandt lived up to the year 1669, and scenes inspired by the Bible. Although there are no color reproductions of paintings by the master, the tremendous genius of the man is apparent in the black and white impressions from the selections. The author has written several serious works on the history of art and was curator of the Jewish Museum in Berlin from 1935 to 1938 when he left Germany because of the Nazis.

BEN MEYERS.

Henry W. Pinkham

UNITY records the recent passing of Henry W. Pinkham, man of vision and courage. In due course, a suitable tribute of his life and work, by John Haynes Holmes, will appear in our columns.

Correspondence

Scientists Become Socially Minded

TO UNITY:

In January of this year a symposium of scientists on the subject of "Calculating Machinery" was held at Harvard at which one of the professors listed to speak refused to do so. He is Dr. Norbert Wiener, an eminent professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and his reason for refusing was that the devices under discussion were for "war purposes."

This action by Dr. Wiener is significant, and indicative of a decisive trend among scientists to emerge from the obscurity of the laboratory to maintain that science should be used for the progress of mankind—not for the destruction of human life and all that makes life worth living.

Evidence is abundant that leading scientists feel an obligation to apply their abilities for the good of humanity. In the editorial of the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," September, 1946, is the following: "The apprehension of a catastrophic development has caused large groups of American scientists to forget their past aloofness in politics and to organize for a fight to prevent science from becoming an executioner of mankind."

The same publication has an article from the *New York Times* by its distinguished science editor, William L. Laurence, who wrote: ". . . the atomic bomb is not just another weapon against which our military minds will find a defense, but the greatest cataclysmic force ever released on earth. Unless some means are found for its control it will inevitably lead to the destruction of civilization."

And in another article in the same issue, "How to Keep the Peace," Prof. A. P. Lerner wrote: "It is necessary to convince them [nations] that general disarmament need not lead to shifts of relative national power, and that the security obtained through it is greater than the protection offered by an arms race." Prof. Lerner is professor of economics at the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, New York.

Still another article in this Bulletin, of special importance, is entitled: "Plans for Nuclear Research in the U. S.," and shows how scientists are planning to devote the results of their research to the benefit of the world: "The primary purpose of the project, according to Dr. Morse, will be one of pure research, looking toward the peacetime application of atomic energy in industrial and medical fields and toward the training of more experts in this new and important field."

The Bulletin referred to is published twice a month by The Atomic Scientists of Chicago. There is also a Federation of American Scientists and a National Committee of Atomic Information. So it would seem that scientists as a whole, and others of highest thinking power, are doing their best to inform the more or less indifferent public of possible dangers ahead which they, as scientists, know better than other classes of people.

Some of the members of the 80th Congress seem well aware of the dangers threatened by an armaments race, by militarizing the minds of our youth, and by other preparations for future war now being demanded or actually undertaken by our government. Scientists realize fully the difficulties encountered by a politician trying to put over a new idea to those whose minds are opposed to its reception. Would it not be an excellent thing to have some scientists in Congress and other responsible government positions where they would have opportunities to do more than talk?

Brookline, Massachusetts. LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Liberty Protects Itself

TO UNITY:

Mr. Harrington, in your December number, has a highly critical letter concerning the editorial, "Freedom Unlimited," in the November issue of UNITY. He takes exception to the statement: "Nor is it valid to say that liberty unlimited opens the door for the entrance of Jesuits, advocates of dictatorship and avowed enemies of liberty. . . . Liberty not only may but should protect itself from the intolerant."

If we look at this problem away from the social tensions of the present day, we shall see that liberty protects itself from the intolerant and the ignorant in educational and scientific realms. Our universities are free universities, but their freedom must be protected by proper tests of scholarship and academic standing. For instance, a university would lose its freedom if it allowed among its professors of philosophy persons whose philosophy was occultism or other species of Medievalism. A scientific institute, such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, would lose its freedom if it permitted its professor of chemistry to teach Madame Annie Besant's "Occult Chemistry." A journal of astronomy would lose its freedom if it opened its columns to advocates of astrology. All of which illustrates that in science and philosophy, even though we proclaim these disciplines to be free and untrammelled by orthodoxy, there are still limits to freedom, the limits being applied precisely to those views which have been proved to be false or unethical by human experience.

Salt Lake City, Utah. ALFRED STIERNOTTE.

More or Better Children?

TO UNITY:

When I read in The Field column of the December UNITY that Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, has accepted chairmanship of a national committee to sponsor the First Nation-Wide Campaign for Planned Parenthood, to be held in February, 1947, I thought of the change in public opinion since the days when Margaret Sanger's women helpers, in trying to assist the poor women of the New York slums, were arrested and, to use her own words: "They even arrested the soap we had at the clinic."

Among the contradictions that confront us whichever way we turn, one of the strangest is the diversity of views in regard to population. So incongruous are these views that they might keep us "between tears and laughter," with Lin Yutang. For while we read that more than half the world is starving, including that part of Germany under the control of the British, we also read that the Royal Commission on Population, set up by Winston Churchill's coalition government in 1944, is much concerned about the lowering birth rate and has sent confidential forms to every tenth woman in the nation, asking questions as to their status in regard to bearing children. The published reports say that several women answered that it was not "fashionable" to have large families and that when a woman went out with several offspring she was made the butt of jokes. About eight percent of those quizzed made no answer, some on "political" grounds, and one woman of eighty-two years replied that she was sorry not to oblige, but she was too old to remember details. Others replied that they did not not like "snoopers."

The *London Times* asked, "Why the blazes have a baby quiz?" Another newspaper asked why the sixteen members of the Royal Commission, which included an earl, a viscount, a knight, two titled women, a working class housewife, three professors, two editors, and a historian, had but forty-one children among them. The latest reports of this commission show a decline of sixty thousand births in England and Wales in one year, and the commission fears that the nation will become one of old people—that is of persons over sixty, if the present rate of decline continues.

Rev. Clarence Elwell of Cleveland, Ohio, director of the diocesan high school and academies, in a recent address to women in St. John's Cathedral in that city, said that "families of six, eight, ten or twelve children are the answer to the program to dechristianize the world." He continued. "We of the Catholic faith today have a great opportunity to offset this anti-Christian propaganda found in our literature and drama, which was begun in the second half of the eighteenth century and is trying to destroy the family with pagan ideals. It is our obligation to be just as clever in our antagonism to it, and there is no more effective opposition than our Catholic faith and its teachings."

A book by Irving Burch and Elmer Pendell, *Population Roads to Peace or War,* says that the ability to feed the world and to free it from war, want, and fear, is the job of establishing a relationship between the number of people on hand and the resources of the world. They declare: "Science and technology cannot protect mankind from want solely by producing more. There must be an intelligent control of man's power to multiply," and they quote the statement of the late Raymond Pearl that the population of the world doubles every seventy years, and of others who claim that a smaller population may be better than a large one, since there would be a greater output per worker, in agriculture, forestry, and mining, and about the same output in manufacturing and trade, but a lower output in communication and transportation. They cite P. K. Whelpton as an authority who says that this country is now over-populated from the standpoint of per capita economic welfare, and that other nations are much worse off.

Margaret Sanger in her autobiography tells of visiting Germany after the first World War, and says: "In Berlin I found myself haunting grocery stores like a hungry animal. For many months many families existed on nothing but turnips. Contact with others in trams, halls, churches, and even streets was nauseating. In a few minutes the fumes of turnips became so offensive that they became almost unendurable to themselves." Though she was welcomed in Japan as a distinguished guest from America, she was not allowed to speak on birth control there. She says: "I could not have believed that any country could contain so many babies. Fathers carried them in their arms, mothers carried them in a sort of shawl, children carried babies, even babies carried smaller babies. Boys with babies on their backs were playing ball, the heads of the babies wobbling so that you feared their necks would be broken. I never saw a Japanese baby slapped or scolded in any way. They all seemed happy and smiling."

Mrs. Sanger quotes Dean Inge thus: "It is not a pleasant prospect if every nation with a high birthrate has a right to exterminate its neighbors. The supposed duty of multiplication and the alleged right to expand are among the chief causes of modern war, and if we justify war it must be a war of extermination, for mere conquest does nothing to solve the problem."

What a pity that the nations with an overflowing population do not have the same religion or the same kind of government that we have!

MAY STRANATHAN.

Cumberland, Ohio.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

WORTH THINKING ABOUT

"Man does not achieve the full nobility of his being when rewards and punishments are meted according to his own easy ideas. The message of the great tragedies is told in the nobility of a man who, in a disaster he did not merit, retains his dignity and rises in his unequal fate to the full stature of a man. We have been matched with overwhelming odds, but our role is not to be paralyzed with fear, rather it is to march forward in the full nobility of our beings, determined to know as much of life as we can encompass."

—*Thaddeus B. Clark.*

ON THE AIR AGAIN

The Indianapolis church, which has been off the air since fall in order to make room for a program by the University of Indiana, has now gone back on the air. Dr. Backus will be speaking each Sunday morning beginning January 26, over WFBM (1260 k) at 9:15. The contract runs through June.

Dr. Backus and the church are convinced that these radio talks are the most effective means of disseminating Unitarian ideas. They also have brought many people to the church.

A volume of previous radio talks by Dr. Backus has been published under the title, *If Thought Be Free.* Copies can be obtained from the Conference Office for $1.00.

BOARD MEETINGS OPEN

The Beverly Unitarian Fellowship of Chicago has announced to its membership that its Board meetings will be open to all members. In their announcement they state: "The Beverly Unitarian Fellowship is not a secret society but a free and open society. It is hoped that as many members as possible will avail themselves of the opportunity of seeing the governing board in action."

MEETING OF A.H.A.

The American Humanist Association held its annual meeting on Monday, February 10th, at the People's Liberal Church, Chicago. The meeting began with a dinner, followed by election of officers and board members. Brief talks were given by Dr. E. Burdette Backus, the retiring President; Philip Schug of Urbana on released time education; and Kenneth Patton of Madison on radical church architecture.

The major speaker of the evening was Dr. Kenneth P. Landon, former Acting Chief of the Division of Southeast Asian Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C., and now a special lecturer in the history of religions at the University of Chicago. Dr. Landon spoke on the subject "Confucianism and the Chinese Revolution."

PUBLIC RELATIONS EXPERIMENT

Through the cooperative efforts of the Division of Publications, the Department of Unitarian Extension, and the Fort Wayne church an experiment in public relations will be carried out in Fort Wayne. Mr. Edward Darling of the Division of Publications will make a survey and assist in establishing a publicity, promotion, and public relations program for the Fort Wayne church. This is the first experiment of its kind to be conducted under the Unitarian Advance program.

G. RICHARD KUCH

G. Richard Kuch, former minister at Rockford, Illinois, and Associate Director of the American Unitarian Youth, has just returned from Europe where he made investigations looking toward the establishment of youth workcamps in France and Czechoslovakia this summer. On February 15 Mr. Kuch assumed the position of Acting Director of the Unitarian Youth, since Mr. Fritchman who has been the director for the past eight years has resigned in order to devote full time to his editorial duties with the Division of Publications.

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

Alfred Stiernotte, a graduate of Meadville Theological School, former assistant at the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, and former minister of the Vancouver Unitarian Church, is now assistant minister at Salt Lake City and managing editor of the *Humanist.*

ALLIANCE SURVEY

Mrs, Edward P. Furber, chairman of the Alliance nominating committee, made a tour through the Middle West interviewing Alliance leaders in regard to nominations for officers to be elected in May. Among her stops were Rochester, New York; Cleveland, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; Grosse Pointe, Michigan, and Chicago, Illinois.

APPEAL PROGRESS

The following Western Conference churches have gone over the top: Angora, Minnesota; Des Moines, Iowa; Kalamazoo, Michigan; the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Illinois; Willmar, Minnesota; and St. Louis, Missouri.

THINGS OF BEAUTY

"At breakfast this morning when I looked out my window toward the west, Pike's Peak was bathed in sunlight. Sprinkled with snow, it stood out sharp and clear in the January air, every line, every shadow showing distinctly like the lines of character in a strong and beautiful face. Yesterday it was different, a study in blue. The morning before, I saw its summit crowned with the rosy tints of dawn starting at the top and creeping down. Sometimes the storms lash about it, sometimes it is lost in dark clouds like man's life down here below, but it always emerges beautiful and victorious. How often have I stopped to look at it and, dismissing all cares from my mind for the moment, thought of the words of the Psalmist, 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills,' and felt better for looking up. How wonderful it is to live in a place where the daily summons is to look up and take heart!"

—*Hurley Begun.*

TENTH ANNIVERSARY MIDWEST UNITARIAN SUMMER ASSEMBLY, COLLEGE CAMP, WISCONSIN, AUGUST 25-SEPTEMBER 1.